

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

I. Status of Claims

Claims 1-8 and 10-12 are pending, claim 1 being amended herein.

Claims 1-8 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Claims 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Bartelmuss et al..

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Bartelmuss et al. further in view of Schiel et al. or Hentila et al. or Iwata et al..

Claim 1 has been amended herein to more clearly recite the claimed invention and differentiate the claimed invention from the cited reference.

The Examiner indicated that claims 3, 4, 7 and 8 would be allowable if rewritten to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

Claims 1-8 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In view of the amendments to the claims it is submitted that the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-8 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, has been overcome.

III. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)/35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Bartelmuss et al.. Claims 1, 2, 5, 6 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Bartelmuss et al. further in view of Schiel et al. or Hentila et al. or Iwata et al.. The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to include the subject matter recited in claim 3 as originally filed. Claims 2-6, 7 and 8 depend from claim 1. Bartelmuss et al. does not disclose a loading device including at least one roller structured and arranged to support the loading member such that the force generated against said loading member by said wire is directed against a side of said roller whereby jamming of said loading member is prevented and wherein each of the at least one roller is coupled to the base member by a rotating shaft to enable the rotation of the roller as in the claimed invention.

U.S. Patent No. 5,660,689 to Bartelmuss discloses a dewatering blade for a wire section having a blade part 4 attached to an intermediate part 3, the intermediate part 3 being attached to a base 2 such that the angle or height of the intermediate part with respect to the base can be adjusted.

The arrangement disclosed in the cited reference does not eliminate the problem that the present invention seeks to address. That is, that is the cited reference does not address preventing the jamming of loading blade when said loading blade presses against a moving wire. The inventors of the present invention have found that when the loading blade presses against the wire the loading blade is subject to a torque arising from the wire movement. As a result of this torque

the loading blade has a tendency to jam. The inventors have discovered that this jamming problem can be solved by using a bearing roller 100 between the loading blade and the base part, the roller serving to prevent the jamming phenomenon.

It is noted that the blade disclosed in U.S. Patent No. 5,660,689 is not a loading blade but a stationary dewatering blade, i.e. it does not move during the formation of the web. Thus, in this type of structure there is no need for arrangements which insure the mobility of the dewatering blade. The device in Bartelmuss et al. uses ball bearings as an aid to adjust the height or angle of the foil. Conversely, in present invention, the loading element immediately reacts to any change of force acting upon it. The inventors have found that by placing rotating rollers on the frame part of the loading element that the static friction between the frame part and the foil part can be alleviated.

In view of the above it is submitted that the cited reference does not anticipate the claimed invention and/or render the claimed invention obvious.

It is believed that this communication is being timely submitted. However, in the event that it is untimely and extension fees are required, this is to be considered a petition for extension and the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any requisite fee to Deposit Account No. 50-0518.

According to currently recommended Patent Office policy, the Examiner is specifically authorized to contact the undersigned in the event that a telephonic interview would advance the prosecution of this application.

An early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

STEINBERG & RASKIN, P.C.

By: 

Paul J. Higgins
Reg. No. 44,152

Steinberg & Raskin, P.C.
1140 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036
(212) 768-3800